

Burbach this morning and he said it was okay with him.

SPEAKER: Senator Burbach.

SENATOR BURBACH: (mike off) by Senator Barnett's statements, I did not understand him to explain it, I believe he left out a term. The unremarried widow--

SENATOR BARNETT: --right.

SENATOR BURBACH: --of a serviceman who has had a 40, 50, 60, 70% disability but it is service connected, that unremarried widow, I feel; Senator Barnett feels and I hope this body feels, that she is entitled to the same benefits as that man who would have had a 100% disability and Senator Barnett's amendment would permit this. It is in concurrence with our Veterans Affairs Department. It is in concurrence with the Revenue Department and I would like to support Senator Barnett in his amendment at this time.

SPEAKER: Any further discussion of the amendment? If not, are you ready for the question? All those in favor of Senator Barnett's amendment, say aye. Those opposed no. The amendment is adopted and this bill will be held in abeyance until Monday.

CLERK: All right, Mr. President, there is now another amendment by Senator Warner. Is this to your director to print it in the Journal or what?

SPEAKER: It will be printed in the Journal. LB 332. Clerk will read.

CLERK: Legislative Bill 332. Introduced by Senator Fellman of the 4th district. (bill read)

SPEAKER: Senator Kremer, would you like to explain the amendment?

SENATOR KREMER: The committee amendments, Mr. Chairman, merely strike sections of the bill that are not needed. Now this is the way the committee understood it. Senator Fellman, introducer of the bill, brought these proposed amendments and this was the information given to the committee. If Senator Fellman would like to explain further what the amendments do, I would yield to him at this time.

SPEAKER: Senator Fellman.

SENATOR FELLMAN: Mr. President and Members of the Legislature. The amendments do just what Senator Kremer said. There was some--the bill went sort of far in its original draft and the amendments limit the bill down. I might just as well explain the, very briefly the purpose of the bill. I don't know that it's very controversial. The bill itself recognizes the collection of antique cars as collection of antique coins or furniture or something like that and allows a collector of antique cars to apply for a license once and a registration and then not have to renew it and not have to pay a tax on it annually. The reason for the bill frankly, is that in some counties around the State these old cars that carry a great deal of value, have been or attempts have been made to value them at a very high value. There are 7, 8, \$10,000 cars that collectors have. The position of the people that own these cars is that it's no more fair for them to pay a heavy tax on a \$10,000 collection of cars than it would be a \$10,000 stamp collection or antique furniture collection and this changes that to equate them. It does not apply to a person if they, unless they own a regular car and have it licensed and so it's limited to the person who collects them. The amendment which